



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,323	08/04/2003	Keith Anthony Washington		5220

7590  
Keith Anthony Washington  
2101 10th Avenue  
Oakland, CA 94606

01/17/2007

EXAMINER
----------

CHENCINSKI, SIEGFRIED E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3692

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/17/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/632,323

Applicant(s)

WASHINGTON, KEITH ANTHONY

Examiner

Siegfried E. Chencinski

Art Unit

3692

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. **Claims 1-4 are rejected** because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-4 are not directed to any one of the areas of patentable subject matter, such as product, process, process of making or composition. For a claim to be statutory under 35 USC 101 the following two conditions must be met:

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Applicant is advised to satisfy the statutory requirements for the claims. Applicant is also advised not to add any new matter to the specification or the claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. **Claims 1-4 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification fails to describe to an ordinary practitioner of the art who would want to implement this invention how to implement it. The specification primarily

Art Unit: 3692

describes the features and benefits of the invention's concept of using numbers associated with a user or customer without going into the details necessary for putting the invention into practical use. The ordinary practitioner would have to engage in an unreasonable amount of experimentation or attempt to have Applicant show him how to put the invention to practical use.

**3. Claims 1-4 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the best mode contemplated by the inventor has not been disclosed. Evidence of concealment of the best mode is based upon a lack of any embodiments of the invention whatsoever, with the best mode absent as well.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**4. Claims 1-4 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: the method steps to use these inventions.

Claims 1-4 provide for the use of certain alpha numeric symbols, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. ON cannot discern if Applicant is claiming a system or a method. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

**5. Claims 1-4 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims describe the general idea of four ways in which to apply Applicant's invention while otherwise remaining vague and indefinite regarding the statutory requirements to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**6. Claims 1-4 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carney et al. (US Patent 5,890,141, hereafter Carney).

**Re. Claims 1-4,** Carney discloses "A system and method for detecting and thus preventing check fraud utilizing a digital computer with image capture and interpretation systems. The system converts the payee information, issue date and the MICR line information (account number, check number and dollar amount) to a check digit which is then placed into the MICR line of a check, printed on its face or transmitted via the paid issuance file to the drawee bank. The drawee bank, upon presentment utilizes a transformation algorithm to convert the printed payee information and issue date on the check into a numerical value that is combined with MICR line information and a check digit is calculated based upon pre-agreed logic. This unique data processing system quickly confirms properly presented checks while effectively precludes payee and other alterations in a cost effective manner." (Abstract). An ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of Applicant's invention would have seen that Carney discloses verification of checks for fraud detection purposes by checking certain characters on a check against another set of characters. An ordinary practitioner would have seen it as obvious that one could also use the address information on a check belonging to a check writer/issuer or other customer to verify the authenticity of the presenter/customer. Therefore, the ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of Applicant's invention would have seen it obvious to use Carney's disclosure to construct an anti-fraud billing system in the following applications:

**Re. Claim 1,** a billing process which bills the actual numbers, and or letters, of a

Art Unit: 3692

person's shipping address, after a person's shipping numbers are entered into the systems database they will then be used to wire that person money, the numbers from the system will then be matched to the person's shipping address for verification of ownership of the systems numbers, if letters are used in the system the merchant will translate the letters into numbers, such as, the letter e will translate into the number 5 for the fifth letter of the alphabet.

**Re. Claim 2,** a system which is made up from the actual numbers of a person's telephone number, the telephone number will be entered into the systems database, to wire that person money, the database uses a person's telephone number for its billing numbers, to be used on telephone orders, the merchant will process the numbers, by matching the numbers to a caller id system for verification of ownership of the systems numbers.

**Re. Claim 3,** a system that uses a valued customer date for its billing numbers, informing the merchant of the date the systems database was created, such as, if the systems numbers read 1982 the merchant will know the systems database issued and created in the year of 1982.

**Re. Claim 4,** which uses an account expiration date for its billing numbers, the system bills the date the account will expire, such as, if the systems numbers read 02/09 the merchant will know the billing numbers on the account will expire February 2009.

**Re. Claims 1-4,** the practitioner's motivation would have been to offer techniques for detecting fraud and abuse in commercial instruments involving customers' shipping addresses, telephone numbers, billing account establishment dates and account expiration dates (Carney, Col. 1, ll. 6-7).

### ***Conclusion***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Siegfried Chencinski whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 3692

(571)272-6792. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 9am to 6pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Richard E. Chilcot, can be reached on (571) 272-6777.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington D.C. 20231***


or (571)273-8300 [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"]

3-6792 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the address found on the above USPTO web site in Alexandria, VA.

SEC

January 5, 2007

  
FRANTZY POINVIL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
*Au 3692*